

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his consideration in and entry of the request for continued examination filed on February 2, 2008.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant thanks the Examiner for consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on March 31, 2008.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

The Examiner stated that regarding *amended* claims 87-94 are rejected to because it is unclear from Applicant's claim language and the specification, how "resources for establishing a multimedia conference" are "an instance of a conference logging service". Specifically, the Examiner states that it is not clear what "an instance" of "a conference logging service" is or how some or all of "the resources for establishing the multimedia conference" constitute this "instancce."

The Examiner stated that regarding *amended* claims 95-104 are rejected to because it is unclear from Applicant's claim language and the specification, how "a plurality of services" that are "distributed over the communications network" are "an instance of a conference logging service". Specifically, the Examiner states that it is not clear what "an instance" of "a conference logging service" is or how "a plurality of services" constitute this "instance."

The above limitations have been amended and thus Applicants respectfully believes the rejection should be removed.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The Examiner stated that claims 87-104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being obvious in light of Ludwig et al. (U.S. 6,237,025) (hereinafter "Ludwig") over Yoakum et al. (U.S. 7,139,797)

Applicant does not believe that Ludwig teaches or suggests all of the previously added limitations. However, purely in the interest of expediting the prosecution of the instant invention, Applicant has amended the independent claims to substantially include the following limitations: including a presence service, an authentication service, a primary service, feature service and conference service, wherein each service is provided by at least one of a plurality of service endpoints and each one of the plurality of endpoints having at least one of the plurality of service endpoints associated with the at least one of said plurality of endpoints.

The Examiner states that Ludwig teaches all the limitations, except "wherein the resources are an instance of the conference logging service that is located via a presence service, wherein the conference logging service removes a pending presence entry of the conference logging service and replaces it with an actual presence entry." However, as stated above and below, Applicant does not believe that Ludwig teaches all the limitations set forth in the independent claims. Thus, Applicant does not believe that Yoakum is relevant to the obviousness rejection of Ludwig.

The Examiner did not include findings of fact regarding the state of the art and the teachings of Ludwig. The scope and content of the current application must be obtained by a thorough review of the specification and claims to understand what the applicant has invented in light of the prior art (Ludwig). **See MPEP §§ 2141 and 904.** In Applicant's opinion, these findings of fact have not been made. Applicant's invention is flexible and state of the art. Ludwig's invention was designed eleven years ago and while Ludwig may have had some foresight, the invention, as developed by Applicant has many features that are neither present nor contemplated in Ludwig.

All the limitations in the present disclosure are not taught or suggested by the cited art. As such, Applicant believes the currently amended independent claims, as well as the claims that depend from them, are in condition for allowance and respectfully request they be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

WEST CORPORATION

Date: August 21, 2008

By: /Raffi Gostanian/
Raffi Gostanian
Reg. No. 42,595
Tel: (972) 849-1310

11808 Miracle Hills Drive
Omaha, Nebraska 68154
(402) 965-7077